

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4-6 are pending in the present application. The Examiner rejected the pending claims in a final Office Action dated July 9, 2008 as being anticipated under § 102(b) by North et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,505,245). Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's courtesy during the telephone interview on November 5, 2008. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider his final rejection in view of the interview and the remarks below.

Claim 1 is directed to a data conversion rule switching device connectable to a target device in which a plurality of software are activated. For example, as illustrated in Fig. 2, controller X is connectable to a target device O that has a plurality of software, *i.e.*, software A, B and C. As discussed during the interview, there are at least two recitations of claim 1 that are not met by North.

First, claim 1 recites the claimed device comprises "a plurality of data communication ports each of which is communicating with one of said plurality of software activated in said target device." Support for this recitation is found throughout the specification and drawings including, without limitation, Fig. 2. Fig. 2 shows each port C1 through C3 of controller X communicating with one of the plurality of software in target device O, *i.e.*, software A, B and C.

In contrast, North fails to disclose the above recitation. Fig. 2 of North discloses a management terminal 30 having a plurality of ports connecting to manageable devices 26-1, 26-2, etc. If a given manageable device, *e.g.*, 26-1, is considered as meeting the recited target device, there is no disclosure that a plurality of ports of the management terminal 30 are communicating with a plurality of software in the manageable device 26-1. Fig. 2 shows only one port of management terminal 30 communicating with manageable device 26-1. There is no disclosure of plural ports of management terminal 30 communicating with plural software in manageable device 26-1.

During the interview, the Examiner appeared to be construing the above-quoted recitation as requiring only one port of the claimed device to communicate with the plural software of the target device. Applicant notes that the recitation provides "a plurality of data communication ports *each of*

which is for communicating with *one of said plurality of software* activated in the target device.”

That is, each of the plurality of communication ports is for communicating with a corresponding one of the plurality of software activated in the target device. In contrast, each of the plurality of communication ports in North is for communicating with a corresponding manageable device – not with a corresponding one of a plurality of software activated in a given manageable device.

During the interview, the Examiner also inquired as to whether the logical grouping 98 of a plurality of manageable devices in Fig. 2 of North results in the manageable devices of that group operating together as a single device. At Col. 9, lines 11-34, North explains that the management terminal 30 has a management application. The application has plural invocations. A logical group of manageable devices, *e.g.*, group A of Fig. 2, is managed by a given invocation of the management application, *e.g.*, invocation A.

Invocation A has an event detection module 102 and an action initiation module 104. As described at Col. 9, line 55 to Col. 10, line 11, the event detection module “analyzes the received data output one of the computing devices 26-1 or 26-2 to determine if, based upon the data received, an event should be generated.” It does so by comparing the received data to a series of text strings stored in memory. Upon a match, the event module transfers selected information to the action initiation module. North explains that the action initiation module initiates an action such as “issuing an instruction to the computing device 26-1 or 26-2 which output the serial data . . .” (Col. 10, lines 5-10.) Thus, the management terminal communicates with the manageable devices on an individual basis. The described logical grouping of the manageable devices is not for communicating with the manageable devices as a group, but rather to consolidate the modules at the management terminal end so that a given management module handles a certain number of devices.

The second recitation of claim 1 not disclosed in North is that the claimed device comprises “a converter for converting operation data corresponding to operation of the plurality of controls and generated in response to the operation in accordance with the data conversion rule set for the selected data communication port.” As discussed above, the management terminal analyzes the received data from a manageable device by comparing the data to a series of text strings stored in

memory and then selects and executes an action based on the analysis. That is, the management terminal interprets the received data and operates in response to the interpretation. There is no disclosure or suggestion that the management terminal “converts” the received data “in accordance with the data conversion rule set for the selected data communication port.” Accordingly, for at least, the reasons set forth above, claim 1 is not anticipated by North.

Claims 5 and 6 are patentable over North for at least the reasons set forth above.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If, for any reason, the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 892-5630 to discuss any steps necessary to place the application in condition for allowance.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing Docket No. 393032044900.

Dated: November 7, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Mehran Arjomand

Registration No.: 48,231
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
555 West Fifth Street, Suite 3500
Los Angeles, California 90013
(213) 892-5200